

### Remarks

The major point of disagreement between the examiner and the applicant revolved around the definition of "age information" and that of "age-event information" in independent claims 1,14, 18 and 21. To clarify this issue, explicit definitions of these terms are now incorporated into the claims, so that reference to the specification is unnecessary to determine their meaning.

As defined, these terms also clearly render the cited prior art inapposite. It is clear that the presented age-event information is related to the comparison of two individuals' ages, and involves presentation of information regarding an event in one of those individual's life at that age. Thus, a birthday card customized for a person of a certain age by including a reference to that age (as is described in Cannon) does not anticipate the invention of a greeting that involves a comparison with another person.

The applicant's responses of 14 April, 2003 to the initial office action, present these arguments in more detail. Once these arguments are considered in light of the definitions of the terms "age information" and "age-event information," it is clear that the specification describes a novel invention unanticipated by Cannon, Tackbary, Simpson, or any combination of these prior art references.

During the interview of 09 September, 2003, the examiners indicated a need to re-examine potential prior art related to the invention, as it was explained during that interview and is now made more explicit by the modified claims. To permit that

examination to occur, this application is now respectfully re-filed as a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

### **Conclusion**

For all of the above reasons, the specification and claims are in proper form, and the claims all define patentably over the prior art. Therefore, this application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully solicited.

### **Conditional request for constructive assistance**

Based on the arguments herein, the specification and claims of this application are proper, definite, and define novel subject matter which is also non-obvious. If, for any reason, this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, the constructive assistance and suggestions of the examiner pursuant to MPEP 2173.02 and 707.07 (j) are requested in order that the undersigned can place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,



Philip R. Krause  
Pro Se Inventor  
Customer Number 35197